117.35 for the purpose of maintenance of the drawbridge. Under this deviation, the Siesta Key Drawbridge (SR 758) need only provide single leaf openings. The deviation is effective on November 22, 2000 from 8 a.m. until 4 p.m.

Dated: November 7, 2000.

#### G.E. Shapley,

Chief, Bridge Administration, Seventh Coast Guard District.

[FR Doc. 00–29101 Filed 11–14–00; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

#### DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

#### Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 117

[CGD07-00-112]

## Drawbridge Operation Regulations: Stickney Point Bridge (SR 72), Sarasota, Sarasota County, FL

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of temporary deviation from regulations.

**SUMMARY:** The Commander, Seventh Coast Guard District, has approved a temporary deviation from the regulations governing the operation of the Stickney Point Drawbridge (SR 72) across the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, mile 68.6, Sarasota, Sarasota County, Florida. This deviation allows the drawbridge owner to provide single leaf openings for vessel traffic. This temporary deviation is required November 20, 2000 from 8 a.m. until 4 p.m., to allow the bridge owner to safely complete maintenance to the drawbridge.

**DATES:** This deviation is effective on November 20, 2000 from 8 a.m. until 4 p.m.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. Barry Dragon, Chief, Operations Section, Seventh Coast Guard District, Bridge Section at (305) 415–6743.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Stickney Point Drawbridge (SR 72) across the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway at Sarasota, FL has a vertical clearance of 18 feet above mean high water (MHW) measured at the center in the closed position. On October 30, 2000 the owner, requested a deviation from the current operating regulation in 33 CFR 117.35 which requires the drawbridge to open promptly and fully when a request to open is given. This temporary deviation was requested to allow necessary maintenance to the drawbridge in a critical time sensitive manner.

The District Commander has granted a temporary deviation from the operating requirements listed in 33 CFR 117.35 for the purpose of maintenance of the drawbridge. Under this deviation, the Stickney Point Drawbridge (SR 72) need only provide single leaf openings. The deviation is effective on November 20, 2000 from 8 a.m. until 4 p.m.

Dated: November 7, 2000.

#### G.E. Shapley,

*Chief, Bridge Administration, Seventh Coast Guard District.* 

[FR Doc. 00–29102 Filed 11–14–00; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4910–15–U

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

#### Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 117

[CGD07-00-110]

## Drawbridge Operation Regulations: Cortez Bridge (SR 64), Bradenton, Manatee County, FL

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DOT. **ACTION:** Notice of temporary deviation from regulations.

**SUMMARY:** The Commander, Seventh Coast Guard District, has approved a temporary deviation from the regulations governing the operation of the Cortez Drawbridge (SR 64) across the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, mile 87.4, Bradenton, Manatee County, Florida. This deviation allows the drawbridge owner to provide single leaf openings for vessel traffic. This temporary deviation is required November 27, 2000 from 8 a.m. until 4 p.m., to allow the bridge owner to safely complete maintenance to the drawbridge.

**DATES:** This deviation is effective on November 27, 2000 from 8 a.m. until 4 p.m.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Barry Dragon, Chief, Operations Section, Seventh Coast Guard District, Bridge Section at (305) 415–6743.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Cortez Drawbridge (SR 64) across the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway at Sarasota, FL has a vertical clearance of 25 feet above mean high water (MHW) measured at the center in the closed position. On October 30, 2000 the owner, requested a deviation from the current operating regulation in 33 CFR 117.35 which requires the drawbridge to open promptly and fully when a request to open is given. This temporary deviation was requested to allow necessary maintenance to the drawbridge in a critical time sensitive manner.

The District Commander has granted a temporary deviation from the operating requirements listed in 33 CFR 117.35 for the purpose of maintenance of the drawbridge. Under this deviation, the Cortez Drawbridge (SR 64) need only provide single leaf openings. The deviation is effective on November 27, 2000 from 8 a.m. until 4 p.m.

Dated: November 7, 2000.

#### G.E. Shapley,

Chief, Bridge Administration, Seventh Coast Guard District.

[FR Doc. 00–29103 Filed 11–14–00; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

## **Coast Guard**

33 CFR Part 117

[CGD07-00-109]

## Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Boynton Beach Boulevard Bridge, Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, Boynton Beach, FL

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DOT. **ACTION:** Notice of temporary deviation from regulations.

**SUMMARY:** The Commander, Seventh Coast Guard District, has approved a temporary deviation from the regulations governing the operation of the Boynton Beach Boulevard Drawbridge (S.R. 804) across the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, mile 1035.0, Boynton Beach, Palm Beach County, Florida. This deviation allows the drawbridge owner or operator to open only a single leaf for vessel traffic. A four hour advanced notice is required for a double leaf opening. This temporary deviation is required from November 14, 2000 until December 31, 2000 to allow the bridge owner to safely complete repairs to the drawbridge.

**DATES:** This deviation is effective on November 14, 2000, until December 31, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Barry Dragon, Chief, Operations Section, Seventh Coast Guard District, Bridge Section at (305) 415–6743.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Boynton Beach Boulevard Drawbridge (S.R. 804) across the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway at Boynton Beach, FL has a vertical clearance of 21 feet above mean high water (MHW) measured at the fenders in the closed position and a horizontal clearance of 125 between fenders. On October 30, 2000 Archer Western Contractors, representatives of the owner, requested a deviation from the current operating regulation in 33 CFR 117.35 which requires the drawbridge to open promptly and fully when a request to open is given. This temporary deviation was requested to allow necessary repairs to the drawbridge.

The District Commander has granted a temporary deviation from the operating requirements listed in 33 CFR 117.35 for the purpose of safely completing repairs. Under this deviation, the Boynton Beach Boulevard Drawbridge (S.R. 804) need only open a single leaf, with a four hour advanced notice for a double leaf opening. The deviation is effective from November 14, 2000 until December 31, 2000.

Dated: November 7, 2000.

#### G.E. Shapley,

Chief, Bridge Administration, Seventh Coast Guard District.

[FR Doc. 00-29104 Filed 11-14-00; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4910-15-P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 52

[MA-25-7197a; A-1-FRL-6882-7]

## Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Massachusetts: Rate-of-Progress **Emission Reduction Plans**

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). **ACTION:** Final rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is approving a State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision submitted by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. The revision establishes 15 percent and post-1996 rate-ofprogress (ROP) plans for the Springfield Massachusetts serious ozone nonattainment area. The intended effect of this action is to approve this SIP revision as meeting the requirements of the Clean Air Act.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** This rule will become effective on December 15, 2000.

**ADDRESSES:** Copies of the documents relevant to this action are available for public inspection during normal business hours, by appointment at the Office of Ecosystem Protection, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, EPA-New England, One Congress Street, 11th floor, Boston, MA; and the Division of Air Quality Control, Department of Environmental Protection, One Winter Street, 8th Floor, Boston, MA 02108.

## FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Robert F. McConnell, (617) 918-1046. SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

# This SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

section is organized as follows:

A. What action is EPA taking today? B. Are the 1990 emission estimates used in the ROP calculations consistent with those approved in the base year inventory?

C. What are the Springfield area's 1999 emission target levels?

D. What is the status of the

Commonwealth's I/M program?

E. When is the Commonwealth expected to meet its 1999 emission target levels?

F. Has Massachusetts revised its Stage II regulation?

G. Has the Commonwealth submitted a contingency plan?

H. What are the current conformity budgets for the Springfield area?

### A. What Action Is EPA Taking Today?

EPA is approving 15 percent and post-96 ROP plans submitted by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for the Springfield serious ozone nonattainment area. On September 27, 1999 (64 FR 51944), EPA published a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPR) for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. The NPR proposed approval of these ROP plans. A supplementary proposed rule was published on November 30, 1999 (64 FR 66829) that provided additional information on the automobile inspection and maintenance (I/M) program to be used in Massachusetts and the timing of 15% and 9% ROP plan reductions. The formal SIP revision was submitted by Massachusetts on April 1, 1999, and amended on June 25, 1999, and September 9, 1999.

## **B.** Are the 1990 Emission Estimates **Used in the ROP Calculations Consistent With Those Approved in the Base Year Inventory?**

The 1990 base year inventory found in the ROP plans for the Western Massachusetts area matches the base year inventory for this area EPA approved in the July 14, 1997 Federal Register (62 FR 37510), with one exception. The NO<sub>X</sub> emission estimate for non-road engines approved in the July 14, 1997 Federal Register document was 19.9 tons per summer day (tpsd); this value was lowered to 17 tpsd in the inventory used in the Springfield area's ROP target emission level calculations. EPA's discussions with Massachusetts indicate that the 17 tpsd estimate used in the ROP plans is incorrect. On September 15, 2000 Massachusetts submitted a letter to EPA confirming that 19.9 tpsd is the correct NO<sub>x</sub> non-road base year emission estimate for the Springfield area, and

submitted a revised target level calculation utilizing the correct value, 19.9 tpsd.

## C. What Are the Springfield Area's **1999 Emission Target Levels?**

The 1999 emission target levels for the Springfield area are 115 tpsd for VOC, and 100 tpsd for  $NO_X$ . The States' projected, controlled emissions for 1999 are both expected to equal the 1999 emission target levels for VOC and NO<sub>x</sub>.

## D. What Is the Status of the **Commonwealth's I/M Program?**

The Commonwealth began its automobile I/M program on October 1, 1999, but experienced routine start-up difficulties which required that full enforcement of the program be delayed for two and one half months. The Commonwealth began fully enforcing the I/M program on December 15, 1999.

In a separate action in the rules section of today's Federal Register, EPA is publishing a limited approval for the Commonwealth's I/M program. EPA has considered whether the ROP plans should also receive limited approval and determined that full approval of the ROP plans is more appropriate. Essentially, the issues that cause EPA to limit its approval of the I/M program have no impact on achieving the reductions necessary to support these ROP plans. The Commonwealth began fully enforcing its motor vehicle emissions testing program on December 15, 1999, and has continued to operate the program since that time without encountering major difficulties. It is the testing of motor vehicles and subsequent requirement that high polluting vehicles be repaired to emit less pollution that achieves the emission reductions attributable to automobile I/M programs. The reason EPA is not granting full approval of the Commonwealth's I/M program pertain to requirements that Massachusetts fully document that the I/M program complies with the provisions of section 182(c)(3) of the CAA. Achievement of these conditions, although necessary for full approval of the I/M program, are not prerequisite to achieving the relatively low level of emission reductions from the program on which these ROP plans rely. The I/M program as currently implemented, and which is fully enforceable in the SIP pursuant to our limited approval, is accomplishing the minimal emission reductions needed to support the ROP plans, and therefore full approval of the ROP plans is appropriate.